UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

Case No. 15-CR-54-WMC-2

AMADOU CAMARA,

Madison, Wisconsin February 2, 2016

Defendant. 1:20 p.m.

STENOGRAPHIC TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING HELD BEFORE CHIEF JUDGE WILLIAM M. CONLEY,

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

Office of the United States Attorney

BY: ROBERT ANDERSON

Assistant United States Attorney

660 West Washington Avenue Madison, Wisconsin 53703

For the Defendant:

Dutch Law Office

BY: GREGORY DUTCH

131 West Wilson Street, Ste. 1201

Madison, Wisconsin 53703

Also appearing:

Amadou Camara - defendant

Jessica Harris - US Probation Officer

Lynette Swenson RMR, CRR, CRC
U.S. District Court Federal Reporter
United States District Court
120 North Henry Street, Rm. 520
Madison, Wisconsin 53703
608-255-3821

(Proceedings called to order.)

THE CLERK: Case Number 15-CR-54-WMC-2. United States v. Amadou Camara called for a sentencing hearing. May we have the appearances, please.

MR. ANDERSON: The United States appears by Assistant U.S. Attorney Robert Anderson.

MR. DUTCH: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

Mr. Camara is present in court with his attorney Greg

Dutch.

THE COURT: Very good. We are here for the sentencing of Amadou Camara. I apologize for my delay in coming out. These series of cases have been difficult ones, Mr. Camara's case not least among them. My first obligation, Mr. Camara, is to confirm that you have read and discussed the presentence report, the revised presentence report, and the addendum to that report with your counsel.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And have you had an opportunity to review the proposed conditions of release, to the extent they may apply here?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very good. I understand the government is moving for an additional one-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility?

MR. ANDERSON: That's correct.

THE COURT: And I will grant that motion, along with the defendant's motion to seal his sentencing memorandum. With those preliminaries, I will accept the plea agreement, finding that the offense of conviction adequately reflects the defendant's criminal conduct and the plea agreement does not undermine the statutory purposes of sentencing.

In determining the defendant's sentence, I will take into consideration the advisory sentencing guidelines and the statutory purposes of sentencing that are set forth at Section 3553(a) of Title 18.

First as to the guidelines, the defendant filed two objections to the presentence report. The first, he objected to the inclusion of a 40-pound load of marijuana in his drug quantity analysis, stating that he did not believe he was involved in that transaction and was elsewhere when the transaction occurred. Corroborating witness statements reflect that the defendant was minimally an investor in that load, whether or not physically present for that specific transaction.

Moreover, given the principal role the defendant played in this conspiracy, the amount was reasonably foreseeable to the defendant, well within the scope of the conspiracy to distribute marijuana and correctly included in the

drug quantity analysis under Section 1B1.3(a)(1). The combined weight of the marijuana attributable to the defendant's relevant conduct is therefore conservatively between 100 and 400 kilograms of marijuana.

The defendant also objected to the four-level increase given his role in the offense as an organizer, leader, manager or supervisor of criminal activity involving five or more participants. He has already acknowledged that a two-level aggravating role enhancement does apply. Over the course of the conspiracy, the investigative materials showed that the defendant helped organize a conspiracy with Enis Gashi, recruited drivers, supplied the money and vehicles to the drivers and transporters, flew to California to broker a deal, and received the marijuana for distribution upon the driver's return to Wisconsin. Accordingly, I have little trouble finding that a four-level enhancement under Section 3B1.1(a) is appropriate for this defendant.

Given these rulings, I find that the probation office has calculated the advisory guidelines correctly using the current guidelines manual and the supplement as well as taking into account all relevant conduct pursuant to Section 1B1.3. The guideline for conspiracy with intent to distribute and possess with intent to distribute marijuana in violation of Section 841(a)(1)

and 846 of Title 21 is found at Section 2D1.1. That section provides an offense involving at least 100 kilograms but less than 400 kilograms of marijuana as a base offense level of 24 pursuant to Section 2D1.1(c)(8). No other Chapter 2 adjustments apply.

With a four-level increase warranted under Section 3B1.(a) [verbatim] because the defendant was an organizer within this conspiracy for reasons I've already explained, his total offense level is 28. However, the defendant qualifies for a three-level downward adjustment under Section 3E1.1, having demonstrated acceptance of responsibility for his offense, both by pleading guilty and by returning to this country to do so and by virtue of the government's motion for an additional one-level reduction. This leaves the defendant with a total offense level of 25 and a criminal history category of I and an advisory imprisonment range of 57 to 71 months, and that is where the Court begins to address sentencing.

The defendant is different from the others who have been before the Court, except for Mr. Gashi, who the Court has yet to sentence, in that he was fundamental to the furtherance of the conspiracy, notwithstanding defense counsel's efforts in his memorandum to characterize his defendant as less than that. I don't think the record really permits another argument, as I've

already addressed. I certainly think there are mitigating factors here, including the defendant's family who appear to be remarkable people who made every effort to provide an opportunity for their son, and I think were he to return to those values, it says much about what the defendant could still be. His willingness to return and accept responsibility for his conduct from overseas speaks to his character, and the fact that he is likely to face deportation is a factor that I will consider.

Having said that, much of the remainder of the defense brief I just don't think rings true, beginning with the fact that the defendant seems to have adopted two lives in this country, one that he portrayed for his family and extended family and friends in that community and the other that he embraced for whatever reason, including the fact that he may have wanted strongly to fit in. He's a bright, talented young man, but he is deserving of punishment given his role here. And I have not decided what that punishment should be.

I am interested in comments from the government, any additional comments from defense counsel beyond the memorandum, and of course comments from the defendant.

And I will begin with the government. Mr. Anderson.

MR. ANDERSON: Well, Your Honor, the presentence investigation report again, as we've seen with many of

the defendants so far, does do a comprehensive job in laying out the nature of the conspiracy and in particular Mr. Camara's role. It is accurate to say that without -- Mr. Camara and Mr. Gashi, before they got together, had their own little things going on. But this conspiracy, this business was joining together to take advantage of sources that Mr. Gashi ultimately had in California and then ultimately some other places as well that whoever other conspirators may have known as sources.

The defendant, not only living sort of the double life that the Court referred to a moment ago, he was — it appeared he was living a high standard life, a high life which was — appeared to be one of the ways that he supported that high life and high standard was by his earnings from the substantial marijuana purchase and resale. As other defendants in this case indicated, Mr. Camara was a major — not just a person who supplied money or a person who joined with the others in — I'll use the term, although I know the Judge doesn't like that — but it was an investment, what they were doing. He supplied —

THE COURT: The only reason I don't like it is I think it's indicative of how far astray the members of the conspiracy got in thinking of themselves as --

THE DEFENDANT: Legitimate?

THE COURT: -- high-flying businessmen as opposed to people engaged in a criminal conspiracy.

MR. ANDERSON: Right. And, you know, I could speculate why they thought that this was either acceptable or legitimate, but it's -- anyway, as other defendants told us, he was a major contributor into the money that was put into loads, which then with him supplying the lion's share or say half of it, the other persons that were putting money in had the benefit of joining in, putting in their smaller amounts of money and getting the benefit of purchase and volume which then they got a volume discount; made it easier for everyone else to purchase.

It's hard to tell where he was getting the large amounts of money that he did or where the large amounts of money that he got have gone we don't know, but without him, without his, number one, investment, number two, supplying, setting up Mr. Christmas as a transporter and providing Mr. Christmas to Mr. Gashi for many of the loads and helping coordinate acquisition/disposition of those loads, I don't think — the enterprise might not have been as successful as it was or gotten as large as it did.

So I think given his higher level, higher standard, along with Mr. Gashi, I think the guideline range

determination is appropriate. Of course the government does recommend the bottom of that guideline range.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Dutch.

MR. DUTCH: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I should have said I've also read many letters written on behalf of the defendant, particularly his father's letter, but the others as well from teachers and friends. They help paint this complete disconnect between one defendant and the other. And it is unfortunate there is such a dichotomy between those two pictures.

MR. DUTCH: So the argue -- not to rehash the argument, but just to talk about Mr. Camara's role, this conspiracy did not start with Mr. Camara and it didn't end with him.

THE COURT: I'm going to try to make this clear to you, Mr. Dutch. I agree that but for Enis Gashi, the conspiracy wouldn't have gotten as big as it did. But your client was already involved in sales and he merged his operation and was crucial to the larger operation.

That's a sad tragic fact. And so arguing that somehow the others are more responsible, I don't necessarily disagree that Enis Gashi may be more responsible, but no one else is more responsible than your client. And I just disagree with your characterization of the record to

the contrary.

MR. DUTCH: And I don't think -- you know, I don't want to talk -- have us talking past one another. I don't think I'm denying any acceptance of his responsibility. I think we've included all of --

THE COURT: Your memorandum and your comments as you start out are both an attempt to characterize him as somehow not as active as some others, particularly Mr. Gashi, but including others who clearly were making direction from Gashi and from your client. And I just have difficulty trying to paint a different picture. I think there are, as I've tried to allude to, other reasons for departure, but I certainly don't think that is one of them.

MR. DUTCH: Well, and I wasn't -- I mean you've made your ruling and I'm not asking you to reconsider that ruling by any chance -- by any means and I'm not trying to diminish Mr. Camara's role in this. I guess, you know, as a lawyer, it was me -- myself, not Mr. Camara, that was trying to maybe split hairs and the Court has said don't do that and I will move on from that.

As far as the reason behind this, I don't think -- and you talk about two different personalities and I could see how that would -- that that would come across

to the Court, but I believe that Mr. Camara, you know, he's not trying to say that he had a drug -- you know, was addicted to drugs or his mental health issues caused this. I think that he has stepped forward and accepted --

THE COURT: In fact there's no indication of either of those things.

MR. DUTCH: And I didn't include that. I mean I think he saw this as an ability to reach out to these other people in the fraternity and to get people to invest and that it was strictly a business operation as part of the enterprise. And I don't think I've ever tried to deviate from that and I don't think Mr. Camara has ever tried to deviate from that. So I just wanted to make sure that, you know, I'm not trying to cloud the Court's judgment here. I think he has fully accepted his responsibility and whether the Court was going to go with a three-level or a four-level, we were never expecting anything less on that.

I think that the -- I've tried to highlight, and I think the Court has of course picked up on the highlights of the positive aspects that Mr. Camara brings. I believe that the idea that he wanted to come back to face these allegations is important and the Court has already mentioned that. I'll try not to reiterate it. But I

will say that he is the only one of these defendants who spent time in a Hong Kong prison, a Chinese prison, and then when he did get back to land in Chicago, he was immediately taken into custody and he's the only one of all of the defendants who has already spent time in the MCC in Chicago and, prior to anybody having issues while on pretrial release, spent time in a county jail. And I think that differentiates him from many of the other co-defendants.

I --

THE COURT: You raise an interesting point which is I'm not sure what credit he gets for that time. I mean he essentially would have been held, even in Hong Kong, on a detainer I assume. I don't know, and I don't know that probation has indicated, if he gets any credit for that period of time.

AGENT: I'm not sure.

MR. DUTCH: I think he would get time though certainly once he was taken into custody in the United States. I'm pretty sure that that would count for time.

THE COURT: And to that extent it also reduces how much credit I can give him since he was, after all, detained overseas before being brought back. So it's a two-edge sword.

MR. DUTCH: I understand that. But I just --

not many people have been detained in a Chinese prison and still has -- and then as the Court, to circle back, talking about this dichotomy, I mean again I think it's -- they're very -- there are really many positive things about Mr. Camara's character that we tried to highlight. We tried to provide letters, not just in support of him, but I know that in speaking with the probation department, there were some issues about prior employment and we had to scurry a little bit. But I believe we have provided the Court ample documentation of his employment record and employment history, and again, I think that goes to his character as well.

I think that since he has been here and my getting to know Mr. Camara since June, I've got to know the family quite well. I've met with his father alone on a number of occasions. I have -- you know, this is such a serious allegation and a serious charge, but for this, this would truly have been a Horatio Alger-type story, Judge, although always with the issue hanging over his head that he did not have a social security number and who knows how that would have been resolved in the future.

But I believe that Mr. Camara in his letter tried to explain and we've just tried to explain that this -- his involvement in this conspiracy was strictly a

moneymaker-type situation and I don't know if his life paths have separated — they separated at some point when he became involved in this conspiracy, but I can say with all honesty and with all humility that the paths that have parted have come together or are coming together maybe would be a better component of this; that his family has acknowledged this and have continued to embrace him; that Amadou has acknowledged this and has tried to focus on the positives. Since he's been out, he's, although living with his parents, he still does have an apartment in Chicago. He has continued to study. He has studies and he's studying for something called the CFA, a Charter Financial Analysis, it's a document. He continues to work. He continues to be in touch with his family.

So I guess, Judge, I'm happy to answer any specific questions. I tried to lay this out as much as possible. I don't know if the Court sees these dichotomy coming together since the end of his involvement in the conspiracy. I hope the Court has seen at least progress towards the two roads becoming -- from being divergent to joining.

THE COURT: Maybe that's a good place to turn to the defendant, Mr. Camara. I did read your letter and I have tried to better understand what led you down this

path. But it is hard to see where you left what were fundamental values of hard work and honesty and the importance of education instilled by your parents to how you became an active participant in this conspiracy and someone who was telling one story to his parents and portraying one individual while living a very different life elsewhere. That's maybe the most difficult thing for me to account for in trying to decide on an appropriate sentence. I'd be happy to hear anything you wish to add.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I want to first start by saying I apologize for the manner in which my actions affected my loved ones. I know, you know, that goes without saying.

THE COURT: It doesn't really go without saying and I really hope that you're not going to try to sell me something today.

THE DEFENDANT: No, I'm not. I'm --

THE DEFENDANT: Yep. I completely understand,

Your Honor. I'm saying this for my loved ones because I

think --

THE COURT: Well then you should say it to them and it doesn't go without saying.

I'm truly sorry about how my actions have affected us.

You know, we come from a very religious background,

close-knit community, and, you know, throughout this

entire process and even during the time I was abroad and

I could return to the U.S., I could feel just the heavy

weight that I've put upon my loved ones and I'm truly

sorry about that. I can't say that enough.

I don't come from a background where, you know -- my parents and my family have done everything they can for me. We've come -- we came to the United States at a very young age and there was never one moment that my parents, my family's predis -- their predisposition prevented them from moving forward. We came here on a travel visa and we stayed here as undocumented aliens. At some point in my -- with that being said, there's a certain point where you lead to an area of desperation and, you know, in turn that makes you forget some of the values that were instilled into you. That's not something that I should have never strayed away from, but --

THE COURT: I'm having trouble finding that desperation in your life. I certainly understand moving from New York and a larger community of Gambian refugees and others to Madison, Wisconsin, where you felt like an outsider and your efforts to try to fit in. But you did

that very well. You assimilated in ways that your parents had strongly encouraged and --

THE DEFENDANT: I did. And --

THE COURT: And yet I don't -- I'm not hearing what then led you -- what it was that motivated you the way -- from someone who was a good student, who was seemingly popular and had friends, to someone who thought it was a good idea to start selling substantial amounts of marijuana and making a lot of money.

THE DEFENDANT: To address that, to be quite frank with you when I got to the University of Wisconsin-Madison, I was still an undocumented alien. I wrote that in my letter, explaining that there was a legislation change in 2011 that basically anyone who was paying instate as an undocumented citizen, you were then — you couldn't — you weren't entitled to those benefits anymore. My parents did whatever they could, earning the wage that they had, and we pulled together and we, you know, attempted to afford a secondary education, which was substantially expensive.

I was working under the table. I had no right to work in the United States. I was still undocumented. I didn't have any opportunity to get any aid. Most of the scholarships I would have received in high school were taken from me because they later learned that I had no

type of documentation, not a social security card or anything. I could be deported at any second.

So, you know, coming into college, I did whatever I could to earn what I could in order to support my family. But they've been through enough. You know, as a man, at some point you need to -- you make your own decisions and then you need to be able to prepare for any consequences that those, you know, decisions entail. So quite frankly I had a point where I didn't have some sort of -- I didn't have an addiction. I didn't -- I quite frankly engaged in it because of the business opportunity behind it. And I'm not going to try to embellish --

THE COURT: You had to know you were putting your own immigration status in tremendous jeopardy by doing it.

THE DEFENDANT: I did.

THE COURT: And you were by your own account earning money in other ways --

THE DEFENDANT: Um-hmm.

THE COURT: -- in legitimate employment,
although I understand and could understand some
desperation in that you couldn't do it on the surface --

THE DEFENDANT: Um-hmm.

THE COURT: -- but you made a lot more money than you necessarily needed to support yourself. You

enlisted others, pulled them into this conspiracy. You changed your lifestyle. I mean it's not -- it doesn't come across as desperation, it comes across as greed.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I understand that, and with that I was very honest with my defense and others I've spoken with to say that --

THE COURT: Not as honest as you could have been with the probation office, which didn't help your cause either. What I'm saying is you're standing up in front of me and being bright and articulate and telling me a story that sounds like a story. It doesn't sound like it's coming from your heart. It doesn't sound desperate. It doesn't sound all that sincere. It may be, but your letter doesn't come across that way and you're not coming across that way now. And I'm concerned for you, as much as I am for an appropriate sentence that unless you figure out how you got here —

THE DEFENDANT: I'm trying to be as sincere as possible, Your Honor, and --

THE COURT: And I don't know what that says. It may be a problem with my ability to discern it; it may also be a problem with you to really get in touch with what's really going on inside, something that you may have developed over a substantial period of time. I don't know.

In any event, I'm happy to hear anything else that you wish to add. I do have a few questions.

THE DEFENDANT: I was just going to wrap up by saying that, you know, to say that everyone, you know, in this enterprise earned the same amount of money or their incentive buys the same way, I don't think that's true at all. I'm not arguing responsibility, but what I can truly tell you is my earnings behind all this was substantially different and I -- when I finally received work authorization and I was able to go on to receive some strong internships and I was making money legally, I developed a trend where I would try to wean myself out of this. There was no -- I can now be in the United States safely and apply for positions safely within a two-year period and not have to worry about being deported.

There was a comment said earlier that, you know, I was living this some sort of high-life lifestyle. I think the only comments that were provided by people in the case were just simply by the way I dressed.

THE COURT: And the fact that you were traveling and doing other things that aren't typical of a college student.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. I'm involved, as you can see, I'm involved in a lot of different things. I modeled for years on campus. I never to one moment tried

to let my predisposition, you know, prevent me from moving forward. So in various facets I tried to, you know, involve myself.

THE COURT: I don't know if you can hear, but you're digging yourself a hole and I don't -- it's interesting that you don't understand that. It's not going to change my sentence very much, but it's indicative of someone who doesn't quite understand what it was they did.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I apologize if I'm not articulate.

THE COURT: You don't need to. What you need to do is stop selling.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not trying to sell, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's try it a different way.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: Can you tell me where you stand with your own degree?

THE DEFENDANT: At the moment, and I explained this in my essay, right now I haven't earned --

THE COURT: Well, you did explain it, but I don't understand it. You went through the process of graduating, that is to say you went through the ceremony. You told your parents you had graduated. And you knew

that you still had a problem with an accusation of plagiarism.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. It was a pending paper, and as I said earlier, I did everything that was told to me --

THE COURT: When was the last time you spoke to the University about it?

THE DEFENDANT: The University? Honestly just a few weeks ago I went to the professor's office and the head of the department to meet with them and they just haven't gotten back to me. I've tried to speak with them on dozens of occasions. I'm not sure if it's a professor being, you know, busy or anything, but I'm still --

THE COURT: It's been quite a period of time since you first pursued this. Let me ask you a second question: What were you doing in Appleton?

THE DEFENDANT: In Appleton, Wisconsin? I went up to Appleton, Wisconsin, to drop off a friend who was visiting me in Chicago, and, you know, I was turning straight back to come back to Madison.

THE COURT: Why didn't you tell your probation officer?

THE DEFENDANT: It didn't occur to me that

Appleton was outside of the district of -- the Western

District of Wisconsin. And I apologize to my probation

officer about that. That was completely my fault, my negligence.

THE COURT: What are you doing currently?

THE DEFENDANT: Currently I'm involved in a couple different things in Chicago. I'm trying to -
I've been interviewing full time for a bunch of different analyst positions.

THE COURT: But you haven't been working.

THE DEFENDANT: I have been working. So as I explained earlier, I'm a musician. I DJ and I produce. And then I also do contract work as an investment analyst. So the company doesn't technically hire you on, but they put you on like a short-term basis with them and then you, you know, you do Excel models or anything they need done.

THE COURT: And what do you plan to do going forward?

THE DEFENDANT: Going forward, to be honest I'm going to continue to, you know, go to the historical sciences department in order to have the professor give me the green light in order for me to obtain the degree. And then from there, you know, whatever happens profession-wise, I want to continue to progress. I want to work. I want to be, wherever I'm at, I want to be a contributing member of society.

I want my family to move past this most of all.

They've been through so much and I just want to be in a position where I'm caring for them and supporting not only myself, but my loved ones through legal means and not having to put them through something like this ever again.

THE COURT: Thank you. I am prepared to render sentence. The defendant is a 24-year-old man who was born in Gambia, Africa, and immigrated to the United States with his family when he was approximately four years old. Upon entering the United States, the defendant and his family moved to New York where they lived for several years before arriving in Sun Prairie, Wisconsin, approximately 15 years ago. His parents admirably provided him with a loving, supporting home and met all his essential needs while including the benefits of modeling, hard work and education.

The defendant adjusted seemingly well to living in the United States, maybe too well to the extent that he seems to have abandoned some of his parents' values, and embraced a new and dishonest lifestyle. While receiving a college education at the University of Madison, the defendant earned an undergraduate degree, as he unfortunately led others to believe. That degree was never issued, mainly because he failed to clear up an

issue of plagiarism. The defendant also reported that he has maintained employment, although only some of that employment could be verified. I understand that partly that may be due to the defendant's immigration status.

The defendant has no prior criminal history. He has no medical problems, although he recently reported treatment for psychotropic medication with respect to an attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. The defendant also has no meaningful history of substance abuse. His crime here appears to be motivated by greed and dishonesty. He has engaged in a cycle of repeated lies or mistruths in order to cover or conceal earlier fraudulent statements. As a result, the defendant's felony conviction in this case may well result in deportation.

In December of 2013, law enforcement learned that members of various fraternities at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, among others, were involved in purchasing and transporting large quantities of marijuana. The conspiracy involved individuals who collectively invested as much as \$80,000 for the purchase of the marijuana in California and Colorado. Others that were involved in the conspiracy transported the marijuana to Wisconsin were paid for their assistance. Many of the individuals involved in this jointly undertaken criminal

enterprise had been classmates at a local high school.

From October 2012 to January of 2015, the defendant and other conspirators arranged for the transportation of marijuana on at least 18 occasions. The total amount of marijuana transported was approximately 500 pounds. As already addressed, the defendant was central to this conspiracy. He organized shipments on a number of occasions and recruited drivers when necessary. The combined weight of the marijuana attributable to the defendant's relevant conduct totals 228 pounds or 103.42 kilograms.

Taking into consideration the nature of the offense as well as the defendant's personal history and characteristics, I am persuaded that a custodial sentence of 30 months is reasonable and no greater than necessary to hold the defendant accountable, protect the community, provide the defendant the opportunity for rehabilitative programs, and achieve parity with the sentences of similarly situated offenders.

As to Count 1 of the Information, it is adjudged that the defendant is committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prison for a term of 30 months. I recommend that the defendant receive educational and vocational training as well as mental health and substance abuse treatment. It is recommended that the defendant be

afforded pre-release placement in a residential re-entry center with work release privileges in the event that he is not deported. At least a three-year term of supervised release is required by statute. The term of imprisonment will be followed by a three-year term of supervised release subject to the standard conditions.

In light of the nature of the offense and the defendant's personal history, I adopt those standard and special conditions proposed in the presentence report, noting that neither party raised any objections to those proposals despite being given advance opportunity to do so. Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, the primary goals of supervised release are to assist the defendant's transition into the community after a term of imprisonment and to provide rehabilitation. Supervision in this case will provide the defendant with needed correctional programming which will include rehabilitative programs, to assist with community reintegration, afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, and protect the public from further crimes perpetrated by the defendant.

Specifically the defendant shall be subject to

Conditions Nos. 9 through -- 1 through 9 and 12 through

15 as outlined and justified in the appendix to the

presentence report. These conditions are warranted

because the defendant was involved in a conspiracy that distributed in excess of 100 kilograms of marijuana into the Madison area. The defendant and his co-defendants were obtaining marijuana from a source in California and the defendant recently traveled nationally and internationally.

The defendant is from Gambia and will be facing an immigration judge regarding his deportation status because of this instant conviction. He has graduated from high school and taken numerous courses at the University of Wisconsin and should be very close to employment and getting his degree, but he does not have fixed employment and he has at least some history of alcohol and marijuana use, although I do not believe that drug testing is required and find that is not necessary under the circumstances here.

It is adjudged that the defendant is to pay a \$100 criminal assessment penalty to the Clerk of Court for the Western District of Wisconsin immediately following sentencing. I also find that the defendant has -- does not have the means to pay any further fine under Section 5E1.2 without impairing his ability to support himself upon release from custody and so I impose no fine.

The U.S. Probation Office is to notify law enforcement agencies and the state attorney general of

the defendant's release back into the community. But I do find and I did reduce the sentence here because of the real opportunity that the defendant still has to lead a meaningful life, a life that will make his parents proud. Whether it is here or in Gambia, there is so much that still is available to this defendant. And for those reasons, I did depart under Section 5K2.0.

There is still the matter of the defendant's continued release. Despite his not having established permanent employment, my understanding is that he has generally complied with the requirements of probation with the exception of this inexplicable decision to drive to Appleton, Wisconsin, and given his lack of criminal history and his continued compliance, I would consider continued release subject to the defendant understanding how important his continued compliance with the terms and conditions of release are. It would be devastating to any possibility of remaining in this country if he were not — if he were to fall out of compliance. And I'll also hear from the government if they wish to argue, unlike the other defendants, this defendant is deserving of immediate custody.

MR. ANDERSON: I don't think Mr. Camara should be treated differently than the other defendants, so in that respect I understand.

emphasize the benefits of your being able to self-report, which I will order that you do 30 days from today between the hours of 10 and 2 p.m., subject to a specific designation of place of reporting. It will increase the likelihood that the Bureau of Prisons will find an appropriate placement for you given your lack of criminal history or any violent past. I am hopeful that you will be placed at a camp appropriate to your circumstances and that you can immediately get started with the work that I think you still need to do. You are clearly articulate and bright and have the ability to do an awful lot with your life. You've now been saddled with a felony, but that has not prevented a lot of other people under much worse circumstances from doing something with their life.

I would urge you to get your degree situation addressed as soon as possible. I would urge you to do as much reading as you can while incarcerated and to begin to put a plan together that will ensure a real healing, not only for yourself, but for your parents that addresses whatever are the underlying causes of the decisions that you make and develop a plan that will persuade immigration to let you stay in this country. You can certainly include my name as among those who would act as a general reference for you. I don't see a

benefit to your being deported at this point. But that is not a decision for this court.

I do see you as someone who has been held responsible for your conduct and I can only urge you to consider the possibility that you need to better integrate your past, which should be a proud past, with your present and that you live one life whole and with integrity. If you do that, I have no doubt that there's any number of things that you can still do to make your family proud, to contribute to the community, and most importantly to make yourself proud, really proud as opposed to the superficial aspects of success.

With that said, I'll hear if there is anything more the government wishes to do. I don't know that you need to move to dismiss the Indictment. You replaced it with the Indictment [verbatim].

MR. ANDERSON: Since he pled to the Information, I do need to move to dismiss the Indictment, yes.

THE COURT: All right. That motion is granted.

Mr. Camara, I am obligated and I do tell you that you
have a right to appeal this Court's sentence. You have
very capable counsel who can explain the possible grounds
for an appeal and the short time you have to file a
notice of appeal, which is 14 days. Again, my hope is
that this can be the beginning of healing and of progress

for you and that having served your debt to society, you will come out of and be treated as someone who still has much to give to society. Is there anything more for the defense at this time? MR. DUTCH: No, Judge. THE COURT: All right. We'll stand in brief recess. (Proceedings concluded at 2:09 p.m.) 9 10 I, LYNETTE SWENSON, Certified Realtime and 11 Merit Reporter in and for the State of Wisconsin, certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate record of the 12 proceedings held on the 2nd day of February 2016 before 13 the Honorable William M. Conley, Chief Judge for the Western District of Wisconsin, in my presence and reduced to writing in accordance with my stenographic notes made 14 at said time and place. Dated this 17th day of March 2016. 15 16 17 /s/\_ Lynette Swenson, RMR, CRR, CRC 18 Federal Court Reporter 19 20 21 22 23 The foregoing certification of this transcript does not

The foregoing certification of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or direction of the certifying court reporter.

24

25